

Enabling Multi-Source Neural Machine Translation By Concatenating Source Sentences In Multiple Languages

Raj Dabre¹, Fabien Cromieres², and Sadao Kurohashi²

¹Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University

²Japan Science and Technology Agency

raj@nlp.ist.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp, fabien@pa.jst.jp, kuro@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel and elegant solution to “Multi-Source Neural Machine Translation” (MSNMT) which only relies on preprocessing a N-way multilingual corpus without modifying the Neural Machine Translation (NMT) architecture or training procedure. We simply concatenate the source sentences to form a single long multi-source input sentence while keeping the target side sentence as it is and train an NMT system using this preprocessed corpus. We evaluate our method in resource poor as well as resource rich settings and show its effectiveness (up to 4 BLEU using 2 source languages and up to 6 BLEU using 5 source languages) by comparing against existing methods for MSNMT. We also provide some insights on how the NMT system leverages multilingual information in such a scenario by visualizing attention.

1 Introduction

Neural machine translation (NMT) (Bahdanau et al., 2015; Cho et al., 2014; Sutskever et al., 2014) enables training an end-to-end system without the need to deal with word alignments, translation rules and complicated decoding algorithms, which are a characteristic of phrase based statistical machine translation (PBSMT) systems. However, it is reported that NMT works better than PBSMT only when there is an abundance of parallel corpora. In a low resource scenario, vanilla NMT is either worse than or comparable to PBSMT (Zoph et al., 2016).

Multilingual NMT has shown to be quite effective in a variety of settings like Transfer Learning (Zoph et al., 2016) where a model trained on

a resource rich language pair is used to initialize the parameters for a model that is to be trained for a resource poor pair, Multilingual-Multiway NMT (Firat et al., 2016a) where multiple language pairs are learned simultaneously with separate encoders and decoders for each source and target language and Zero Shot NMT (Johnson et al., 2016) where a single NMT system is trained for multiple language pairs that share all model parameters thereby allowing for multiple languages to interact and help each other improve the overall translation quality.

Multi-Source Machine Translation is an approach that allows one to leverage N-way (N-lingual) corpora to improve translation quality in resource poor as well as resource rich scenarios. N-way (or N-lingual) corpora are those in which translations of the same sentence exist in N different languages¹. A realistic scenario is when N equals 3 since there exist many domain specific as well as general domain trilingual corpora. For example, in Spain international news companies write news articles in English as well as Spanish and thus it is possible to utilize the same sentence written in two different languages to translate to a third language like Italian by utilizing a large English-Spanish-Italian trilingual corpus. However there do exist N-way corpora (ordered from largest to smallest according to number of lines of corpora) like United Nations (Ziems et al., 2016), Europarl (Koehn, 2005), Ted Talks (Cettolo et al., 2012) ILCI (Jha, 2010) and Bible (Christodouloupoulos and Steedman, 2015) where the same sentences are translated into more than 5 languages.

Two major approaches for Multi-Source NMT (MSNMT) have been explored, namely the multi-

¹Sometimes a N-lingual corpus is available as N-1 bilingual corpora (leading to N-1 sources), each having a fixed target language (typically English) and share a number of target language sentences.

encoder (Zoph and Knight, 2016) and multi-source ensembling (Garmash and Monz, 2016; Firat et al., 2016b). The multi-encoder approach involves extending the vanilla NMT architecture to have an encoder for each source language leading to larger models and it is clear that NMT can accommodate multiple languages (Johnson et al., 2016) without needing to resort to a larger parameter space. Moreover, since the encoders for each source language are separate it is difficult to explore how the source languages contribute towards the improvement in translation quality. On the other hand, the ensembling approach is simpler since it involves training multiple bilingual NMT models each with a different source language but the same target language. This method also helps eliminate the need for N-way corpora which allows one to exploit bilingual corpora which are larger in size. Multi-source NMT ensembling works in essentially the same way as single-source NMT ensembling does except that each of the systems in the ensemble take source sentences in different languages. In the case of a multilingual multi-way NMT model, multi-source ensembling is a form of self-ensembling but such a model contains too many parameters and is difficult to train. Multi-source ensembling by using separate models for each source language involves the overhead of learning an ensemble function and hence this method is not truly end-to-end.

To overcome the limitations of both the approaches we propose a new simplified end-to-end method that avoids the need to modify the NMT architecture as well as the need to learn an ensemble function. We simply propose to concatenate the source sentences leading to a parallel corpus where the source side is a long multilingual sentence and the target side is a single sentence which is the translation of the aforementioned multilingual sentence. This corpus is then fed to any NMT training pipeline whose output is a multi-source NMT model. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- A novel preprocessing step that allows for MSNMT without any change to the NMT architecture².
- An exhaustive study of how our approach works in a resource poor as well as a resource rich setting.

²One additional benefit of our approach is that any NMT architecture can be used, be it attention based or hierarchical NMT.

- An empirical comparison of our approach against two existing methods (Zoph and Knight, 2016; Firat et al., 2016b) for MSNMT.
- An analysis of how NMT gives more importance to certain linguistically closer languages while doing multi-source translation by visualizing attention vectors.

2 Related Work

One of the first studies on multi-source MT (Och and Ney, 2001) was done to see how word based SMT systems would benefit from multiple source languages. Although effective, it suffered from a number of limitations that classic word and phrase based SMT systems do including the inability to perform end-to-end training. In the context of NMT, the work on multi-encoder multi source NMT (Zoph and Knight, 2016) is the first of its kind end-to-end approach which focused on utilizing French and German as source languages to translate to English. However their method led to models with substantially larger parameter spaces and they did not study the effect of using more than 2 source languages. Multi-source ensembling using a multilingual multi-way NMT model (Firat et al., 2016b) is an end-to-end approach but requires training a very large and complex NMT model. The work on multi-source ensembling which uses separately trained single source models (Garmash and Monz, 2016) is comparatively simpler in the sense that one does not need to train additional NMT models but the approach is not truly end-to-end since it needs an ensemble function to be learned to effectively leverage multiple source languages. In all three cases one ends up with either one large model or many small models.

3 Overview of Our Method

Refer to Figure 1 for an overview of our method which is as follows:

- For each target sentence concatenate the corresponding source sentences leading to a parallel corpus where the source sentence is a very long sentence that conveys the same meaning in multiple languages. An example line in such a corpus would be: source: “Hello Bonjour Namaskar Kamusta Hallo” and target: “konnichiwa”. The 5 source languages here are English, French, Marathi,




Figure 1: Our proposed Multi-Source NMT Approach.

Filipino and Luxembourgish whereas the target language is Japanese. In this example each source sentence is a word conveying “Hello” in different languages. We romanize the Marathi and Japanese words for readability.

- Apply word segmentation to the source and target sentences, Byte Pair Encoding (BPE)³ (Sennrich et al., 2016a) in our case, to overcome data sparsity and eliminate the unknown word rate.
- Use the training corpus to learn an NMT model using any off the shelf NMT toolkit.

4 Experimental Settings

All of our experiments were performed using an encoder-decoder NMT system with attention for the various baselines and multi-source experiments. In order to enable infinite vocabulary and reduce data sparsity we use the Byte Pair Encoding (BPE) based word segmentation approach (Sennrich et al., 2016b). However we perform a slight modification to the original code where instead of specifying the number of merge operations manually we specify a desired vocabulary size and the BPE learning process automatically stops after it learns enough rules to obtain the prespecified vocabulary size. We prefer this approach since it allows us to learn a minimal model and it resembles the way Google’s NMT system (Wu et al., 2016)

³The BPE model is learned only on the training set.

works with the Word Piece Model (WPM) (Schuster and Nakajima, 2012). We evaluate our models using the standard BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) metric⁴ on the translations of the test set. Baseline models are simply ones trained from scratch by initializing the model parameters with random values.

4.1 Languages and Corpora Settings

All of our experiments were performed using the publicly available ILCI⁵ (Jha, 2010), United Nations⁸ (Ziems et al., 2016) and IWSLT⁹ (Cettolo et al., 2015) corpora.

The ILCI corpus is a 6-way multilingual corpus spanning the languages Hindi, English, Tamil, Telugu, Marathi and Bengali was provided as a part of the task. The target language is Hindi and thus there are 5 source languages. The training, development and test sets contain 45600, 1000 and 2400 6-lingual sentences respectively¹⁰. Hindi, Bengali and Marathi are Indo-Aryan languages, Telugu and Tamil are Dravidian languages and English

⁴This is computed by the multi-bleu.pl script, which can be downloaded from the public implementation of Moses (Koehn et al., 2007).

⁵This was used for the Indian Languages MT task in ICON 2014⁶ and 2015⁷.

⁸<https://conferences.unite.un.org/uncorpus>

⁹<https://wit3.fbk.eu/mt.php?release=2016-01>

¹⁰In the task there are 3 domains: health, tourism and general. However, we focus on the general domain in which half the corpus comes from the health domain the other half comes from the tourism domain.

corpus type	Languages	train	dev2010	tst2010/tst2013
3 lingual	Fr, De, En	191381	880	1060/886
4 lingual	Fr, De, Ar, En	84301	880	1059/708
5 lingual	Fr, De, Ar, Cs, En	45684	461	1016/643

Table 1: Statistics for the the N-lingual corpora extracted for the languages French (Fr), German (De), Arabic (Ar), Czech (Cs) and English (En)

is a European language. In this group English is the farthest from Hindi, grammatically speaking, whereas Marathi is the closest to it. Morphologically speaking, Bengali is closer to Hindi compared to Marathi (which has agglutinative suffixes) but Marathi and Hindi share the same script and they also share more cognates compared to the other languages. It is natural to expect that translating from Bengali and Marathi to Hindi should give Hindi sentences of higher quality as compared to those obtained by translating from the other languages and thus using these two languages as source languages in multi-source approaches should lead to significant improvements in translation quality. We verify this hypothesis by exhaustively trying all language combinations.

The IWSLT corpus is a collection of 4 bilingual corpora spanning 5 languages where the target language is English: French-English (234992 lines), German-English (209772 lines), Czech-English (122382 lines) and Arabic-English (239818 lines). Linguistically speaking French and German are the closest to English followed by Czech and Arabic. In order to obtain N-lingual sentences we only keep the sentence pairs from each corpus such that the English sentence is present in all the corpora. From the given training data we extract trilingual (French, German and English), 4-lingual (French, German, Arabic and English) and 5-lingual corpora. Similarly we extract 3, 4 and 5 lingual development and test sets. The IWSLT corpus (downloaded from the link given above) comes with a development set called dev2010 and test sets named tst2010 to tst2013 (one for each year from 2010 to 2013). Unfortunately only the tst2010 and tst2013 test sets are N-lingual. Refer to Table 1 which contains the number of lines of training, development and test sentences we extracted.

The UN corpus spans 6 languages (French, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese, Russian and English) and we used the 6-lingual version for our multisource experiments. Although there are 11 million 6-lingual sentences we use only 2 million for training since

our purpose was not to train the best system but to show that using additional source languages is useful. The development and test sets provided contain 4000 lines each and are also available as 6-lingual sentences. We chose English to be the target language and focused on Spanish, French, Arabic and Russian as source languages. Due to lack of computational facilities we only worked with the following source language combinations: French and Spanish, French and Russian, French and Arabic and Russian and Arabic.

4.2 NMT Systems and Model Settings

For training various NMT systems, we used the open source KyotoNMT system¹¹ (Cromieres et al., 2016). KyotoNMT implements an Attention based Encoder-Decoder (Bahdanau et al., 2015) with slight modifications to the training procedure. We modify the NMT implementation in KyotoNMT to enable multi encoder multi source NMT. Since the NMT model architecture used in (Zoph and Knight, 2016) is different from the one in KyotoNMT the multi encoder implementation is not identical (but is equivalent) to the one in the original work. For the rest of the paper “baseline” systems indicate single source NMT models trained on bilingual corpora. We train and evaluate the following models:

- One source to one target.
- N source to one target using our proposed multi source approach.
- N source to one target using the multi encoder multi source approach (Zoph and Knight, 2016).
- N source to one target using the multi source ensembling approach that late averages (Firat et al., 2016b) N one source to one target models¹².

The model and training details are as follows:

- BPE vocabulary size: 8k¹³ (separate models

¹¹<https://github.com/fabiencro/knmt>

¹²In the original work a single multilingual multiway NMT model was trained and ensembled but we train separate NMT models for each source language.

¹³We also try vocabularies of size 16k and 32k but they

for source and target) for ILCI and IWSLT corpora settings and 16k for the UN corpus setting. When training the BPE model for the source languages we learn a single shared BPE model so that the total source side vocabulary size is 8k (or 16k as applicable). In case of languages that use the same script it allows for cognate sharing thereby reducing the overall vocabulary size.

- Embeddings: 620 nodes
- RNN for encoders and decoders: LSTM with 1 layer, 1000 nodes output. Each encoder is a bidirectional RNN.
- In the case of multiple encoders, one for each language, each encoder has its own separate vocabulary.
- Attention: 500 nodes hidden layer. In case of the multi encoder approach there is a separate attention mechanism per encoder.
- Batch size: 64 for single source, 16 for 2 sources and 8 for 3 sources and above for IWSLT and ILCI corpora settings. 32 for single source and 16 for 2 sources for the UN corpus setting.
- Training steps: 10k¹⁴ for 1 source, 15k for 2 source and 40k for 5 source settings when using the IWSLT and ILCI corpora. 200k for 1 source and 400k for 2 source for the UN corpus setting to ensure that in both cases the models get saturated with respect to their learning capacity.
- Optimization algorithms: Adam with an initial learning rate of 0.01
- Choosing the best model: Evaluate the model on the development set and select the one with the best BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) after reversing the BPE segmentation on the output of the NMT model.

We train and evaluate the following NMT models using the ILCI corpus:

- One source to one target: 5 models (Baselines)
- Two source to one target: 10 models (5 source languages, choose 2 at a time)
- Five source to one target: 1 model

For evaluation we translate the test set sentences using a beam search decoder with a beam of size 16 for all corpora settings¹⁵. In the IWSLT cor-

pus setting we did not try various combinations of source languages as we did in the ILCI corpus setting. We train and evaluate the following NMT models for each N-lingual corpus:

Source Language 1	Source Language 2			
	En (11.08)	Mr (24.60)	Ta (10.37)	Te (16.55)
Bn (19.14)	20.70* 19.45 19.10	29.02 30.10* 27.33	19.85 20.79* 18.26	22.73 24.83* 22.14
En (11.08)	-	25.56* 23.06 26.01	14.03 15.05* 13.30	18.91 19.68* 17.53
Mr (24.60)	-	-	25.64* 24.70 23.79	27.62 28.00* 26.83
Ta (10.37)	-	-	-	18.14 19.11* 17.34
All	31.56* 30.29 28.31			

Table 2: BLEU scores for two source to one target setting for all language combinations and for five source to one target using the ILCI corpus. The languages are Bengali (Bn), English (En), Marathi (Mr), Tamil (Ta), Telugu (Te) and Hindi (Hi). Each cell in the upper right triangle contains the BLEU scores using a. Our proposed approach (bold), b. Multi source ensembling approach and c. Multi Encoder Multi Source approach. The highest score is the one with the asterisk mark (*).

pus setting we did not try various combinations of source languages as we did in the ILCI corpus setting. We train and evaluate the following NMT models for each N-lingual corpus:

- One source to one target: N-1 models (Baselines; 2 for the trilingual corpus, 3 for the 4-lingual corpus and 4 for the 5-lingual corpus)
- N-1 source to one target: 3 models (1 for trilingual, 1 for 4-lingual and 1 for 5-lingual)

Similarly for the UN corpus setting we only tried the following 2 source combinations: French+Spanish, French+Arabic, French+Russian, Russian+Arabic. The target language is English.

For the results of the ILCI corpus setting, refer to Table 5 for the BLEU scores for individual language pairs. Table 2 contains the BLEU scores for all combinations of source languages, two at a time. Each cell in the upper right triangle contains the BLEU score and the difference compared to the best BLEU obtained using either of the languages for the two source to one target setting where the source languages are specified in

16 but found that the differences in BLEU between beam sizes 12 and 16 are small and gains in BLEU for beam sizes beyond 16 are insignificant

¹⁴We observed that the models start overfitting around 7k-8k iterations

¹⁵We performed evaluation using beam sizes 4, 8, 12 and

Corpus Type	Language Pair	tst2010	tst2013	Number of sources	tst2010	tst2013
3 lingual 191381 lines	Fr-En	19.72	22.05	2 sources	22.56*/18.64/22.03	24.02*/18.45/23.92
	De-En	16.19	16.13			
4 lingual 84301 lines	Fr-En	9.02	7.78	3 sources	11.70/12.86*/10.30	9.16/9.48*/7.30
	De-En	7.58	5.45			
	Ar-En	6.53	5.25			
5 lingual 45684 lines	Fr-En	6.69	6.36	4 sources	8.34/9.23*/7.79	6.67*/6.49/5.92
	De-En	5.76	3.86			
	Ar-En	4.53	2.92			
	Cs-En	4.56	3.40			

Table 3: BLEU scores for the baseline and N source settings using the IWSLT corpus. The languages are French (Fr), German (De), Arabic (Ar), Czech (Cs) and English (En). Each cell in the upper right triangle contains the BLEU scores using a. Our proposed approach (bold), b. Multi source ensembling approach and c. Multi Encoder Multi Source approach. The highest score is the one with the asterisk mark (*)

Language Pair	BLEU	Language Combination	BLEU
Es-En	49.20	Es+Fr-En	49.93*+ 46.65 47.39
Fr-En	40.52	Fr+Ru-En	43.99*+ 40.63 42.12+
Ar-En	40.58	Fr+Ar-En	43.85+ 41.13+ 44.06*+
Ru-En	38.94	Ar+Ru-En	41.66+ 43.12+ 43.69*+

Table 4: BLEU scores for the baseline and 2 source settings using the UN corpus. The languages are Spanish (Es), French (Fr), Russian (Ru), Arabic (Ar) and English (En). Each cell in the upper right triangle contains the BLEU scores using a. Our proposed approach (bold), b. Multi source ensembling approach and c. Multi Encoder Multi Source approach. The highest score is the one with the asterisk mark (*). Entries with an asterisk mark (+) next to them indicate BLEU scores that are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) compared to those obtained using either of the source languages independently.

Language Pair	BLEU
Bengali-Hindi	19.14
English-Hindi	11.08
Marathi-Hindi	24.60
Tamil-Hindi	10.37
Telugu-Hindi	16.55

Table 5: BLEU scores for the translations from individual source languages to Hindi using the ILCI corpus

the leftmost and topmost cells. The last row of Table 2 contains the BLEU score for the setting which uses all 5 source languages and the difference compared to the best BLEU obtained using any single source language.

For the results of the IWSLT corpus setting, refer to Table 3. Finally, refer to Table 4 for the UN corpus setting.

4.3 Analysis

From Tables 2, 3 and Table 4 it is clear that our simple source sentence concatenation based approach is able to leverage multiple languages leading to significant improvements compared to the BLEU scores obtained using any of the individual source languages. The ensembling and the multi encoder approaches also lead to improvements in BLEU. It should be noted that in a resource poor scenario ensembling outperforms all other approaches but in a resource scenario our method as well as the multi encoder are much better. However, one important aspect of our approach is that the model size for the multi source systems is the same as that of the single source systems since the vocabulary sizes are exactly the same. The multi encoder systems involve more parameters whereas the ensembling approach does not allow for the source languages to truly interact with each other.

In the case of the ILCI corpus setting, the BLEU scores of the baseline systems indicate that the closeness of the source language to Hindi (the target) influence the translation quality since translating from Marathi gives the highest BLEU score followed by Bengali and Telugu. Marathi and Bengali are the closest to Hindi (linguistically

speaking) compared to the other languages and thus when used together they help obtain an improvement of 4.39 BLEU points compared to when Marathi is used as the only source language (24.63). It is also surprising to note that Marathi and Telugu also work together to give an improvement of 2.99 BLEU points compared to when Marathi is used as the only source language because Telugu being a Dravidian language is quite different from Marathi and Hindi. Currently we do not have a clear idea as to why this happens but it does help us understand that it is not a mere coincidence that Bengali and Telugu used as source languages also give an improvement of 3.52 BLEU points compared to when Bengali is the only source language.

In general it is clear that no matter which source languages are combined there are gains over when the individual source languages are used. However it can be seen that combining any of Marathi, Bengali and Telugu with either of English or Tamil lead to smaller gains. This seems to indicate that although multiple source languages do help it is better to use source languages that are linguistically closer to each other (as evidenced by how well Marathi and Bengali work when used together). Finally, looking at the last row of Table 2 shows us that using additional languages lead to further gains leading to a BLEU score of 31.3 which is 6.5 points above when only Marathi is used as the only source language and 2.11 points above when Marathi and Bengali are used as the source languages. Having five source languages is uncommon and although it does show that increasing the number of source languages does have a positive impact, there are diminishing returns¹⁶.

Similar gains in BLEU are observed in the case of the IWSLT corpus setting. Halving the size of the training corpus (from trilingual to 4-lingual) leads to baseline BLEU scores being reduced by half (19.72 to 9.62 for French-English tst2010 test set) but using an additional source leads to a gain of roughly 2 BLEU points. Although the gains are not as high as seen in the ILCI corpus setting it must be noted that the test set for the ILCI corpus is easier in the sense that it contains many short sentences compared to the IWSLT test sets. Our method does not show any gains in BLEU for the tst2013 test set in the 4-lingual setting, an anomaly

which we plan to investigate in the future.

Finally in the large training corpus setting, where we used approximately 2 million training sentences, we also obtained statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) increments in BLEU. In the case of the single source systems we observed that the BLEU score for Spanish-English was around 9 BLEU points higher than for French-English which is consistent with the observations in the original work concerning the construction of the UN corpus (Ziems et al., 2016). Furthermore, combining using French and Spanish together leads to a small (0.7) improvement in BLEU (over Spanish-English) that is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) which is to be expected since the BLEU for Spanish-English is already much better than the BLEU for French-English. Since the BLEU scores for French, Arabic and Russian to English are closer to each other we can see that the BLEU scores for French+Arabic, French+Russian and Arabic+Russian to English are around 3 BLEU points higher than those of their respective single source counterparts. In general it can be seen that our method is language and domain independent. However, in a resource rich scenario, if the translation quality (in terms of BLEU) of any of the single source systems is much higher (9 BLEU points) compared to the others then the gains obtained by combining the corresponding source with other sources are not high.

4.4 Studying multi-source attention

In order to understand whether or not our multi-source NMT approach prefers certain language over others, we extracted a subset of 50 random sentences from the test set and obtained visualizations for the attention vectors. Refer to Figure 2 for an example. The words of the target sentence in Hindi are arranged from top to bottom along the rows where as the words of the multi-source sentence are arranged from right to left across the columns. Note that the source languages are in the following order: Bengali, English, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu. The most interesting thing that can be seen is that the attention mechanism focuses on each language but with varying degrees of focus. Bengali, Marathi and Telugu are the three languages that receive most of the attention whereas English and Tamil barely receive any. This clearly reflects how when either of Bengali or Telugu were combined with Marathi there were sig-

¹⁶As future work it will be worthwhile to investigate the diminishing returns obtained per additional language.

nificant gains in BLEU. Building on this observation we believe that the gains we obtained by using all 5 source languages were mostly due to Bengali, Telugu and Marathi whereas the NMT system learns to practically ignore Tamil and English. However there does not seem to be any detrimental effect of using English and Tamil.

From Figure 3 it can be seen that this observation also holds in the UN corpus setting for French+Spanish to English where the attention mechanism gives a higher weight to Spanish words compared to French words. It is also interesting to note that the attention can potentially be used to extract a multilingual dictionary simply by learning a N-source NMT system and then generating a dictionary by extracting the words from the source sentence that receive the highest attention for each target word generated.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed and evaluated a simple approach for “Multi-Source Neural Machine Translation” without modifying the NMT system architecture in a resource poor as well as a resource rich setting using the ILCI, IWSLT and UN corpora. We have compared our approach with two other previously proposed approaches and showed that it is highly effective, domain and language independent and the gains are significant. We furthermore observed, by visualizing attention, that NMT focuses on some languages by practically ignoring others indicating that language relatedness is one of the aspects that should be considered in a multilingual MT scenario. In the future we plan on conducting a full scale investigation of the language relatedness phenomenon by considering even more languages in resource rich as well as resource poor scenarios.

References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2015)*. International Conference on Learning Representations, San Diego, USA.
- M Cettolo, J Niehues, S Stüker, L Bentivogli, R Cattoni, and M Federico. 2015. The iwslt 2015 evaluation campaign. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation (IWSLT)*.
- Mauro Cettolo, Christian Girardi, and Marcello Federico. 2012. Wit³: Web inventory of transcribed and translated talks. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation (EAMT)*. Trento, Italy, pages 261–268.
- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Çalar Gülçehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. [Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Doha, Qatar, pages 1724–1734. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D14-1179>.
- Christos Christodouloupoulos and Mark Steedman. 2015. [A massively parallel corpus: the bible in 100 languages](#). *Language Resources and Evaluation* 49(2):375–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-014-9287-y>.
- Fabien Cromieres, Chenhui Chu, Toshiaki Nakazawa, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2016. [Kyoto university participation to wat 2016](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Asian Translation (WAT2016)*. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, Osaka, Japan, pages 166–174. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/W16-4616>.
- Orhan Firat, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016a. [Multi-way, multilingual neural machine translation with a shared attention mechanism](#). In *NAACL HLT 2016, The 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, San Diego California, USA, June 12-17, 2016*. pages 866–875. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/N/N16/N16-1101.pdf>.
- Orhan Firat, Baskaran Sankaran, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Fatos T. Yarman-Vural, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2016b. [Zero-resource translation with multi-lingual neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. pages 268–277. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/D/D16/D16-1026.pdf>.
- Ekaterina Garmash and Christof Monz. 2016. [Ensemble learning for multi-source neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, Osaka, Japan, pages 1409–1418. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/C16-1133>.
- Girish Nath Jha. 2010. The tdil program and the indian language corpora initiative (ilci). In Nicoletta Calzolari (Conference Chair), Khalid Choukri, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, Mike Rosner, and Daniel Tapias, editors, *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*




Figure 2: Attention Visualization for ILCI corpus setting with all 5 source languages




Figure 3: Attention Visualization for UN corpus setting with French and Spanish as source languages

- (LREC'10). European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Valletta, Malta.
- Melvin Johnson, Mike Schuster, Quoc V. Le, Maxim Krikun, Yonghui Wu, Zhipeng Chen, Nikhil Thorat, Fernanda B. Viégas, Martin Wattenberg, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. [Google's multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation](#). *CoRR* abs/1611.04558. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.04558>.
- Philipp Koehn. 2005. [Europarl: A Parallel Corpus for Statistical Machine Translation](#). In *Conference Proceedings: the tenth Machine Translation Summit*. AAMT, AAMT, Phuket, Thailand, pages 79–86. <http://mt-archive.info/MTS-2005-Koehn.pdf>.
- Philipp Koehn, Hieu Hoang, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, Chris Dyer, Ondrej Bojar, Alexandra Constantin, and Evan Herbst. 2007. Moses: Open source toolkit for statistical machine translation. In *ACL*. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- Franz Josef Och and Hermann Ney. 2001. Statistical multi-source translation. In *Proceedings of MT Summit*. volume 8, pages 253–258.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, ACL '02, pages 311–318. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135>.
- Mike Schuster and Kaisuke Nakajima. 2012. [Japanese and korean voice search](#). In *2012 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2012, Kyoto, Japan, March 25-30, 2012*. pages 5149–5152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2012.6289079>.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016a. [Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2016, August 7-12, 2016, Berlin, Germany, Volume 1: Long Papers*. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/P/P16/P16-1009.pdf>.
- Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016b. [Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany, pages 1715–1725. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P16-1162>.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. 2014. [Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, NIPS'14, pages 3104–3112. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2969033.2969173>.
- Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhipeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. [Google's neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation](#). *CoRR* abs/1609.08144. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08144>.
- Micha Ziemski, Marcin Junczys-Dowmunt, and Bruno Pouliquen. 2016. The united nations parallel corpus v1.0. In Nicoletta Calzolari (Conference Chair), Khalid Choukri, Thierry Declerck, Sara Goggi, Marko Grobelnik, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Helene Mazo, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, and Stelios Piperidis, editors, *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2016)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Paris, France.
- Barret Zoph and Kevin Knight. 2016. [Multi-source neural translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, San Diego, California, pages 30–34. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N16-1004>.
- Barret Zoph, Deniz Yuret, Jonathan May, and Kevin Knight. 2016. [Transfer learning for low-resource neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2016, Austin, Texas, USA, November 1-4, 2016*. pages 1568–1575. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/D/D16/D16-1163.pdf>.